

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A
PART 1: SUMMARY OF DEFENDANTS' ARGUMENTS FOR DISMISSAL OF IPPs'
INDIVIDUAL STATE LAW ANTITRUST CLAIMS

	Which Plaintiffs Asserted a Claim	Defendants' Arguments for Dismissal							
		Failure To State a Claim and Plead Injury-In-Fact	No Named Resident Plaintiff for Claim Alleged	Indirect Purchasers Lack Antitrust Standing (Exhibit C)	Indirect Purchaser Class Actions Barred	<i>Illinois Brick</i> Bars Indirect Purchaser Suits	Cannot Assert Retroactive Claim	Insufficient Intrastate Nexus Allegations (Exhibit D)	Barred By Statute of Limitations (Exhibit J)
Arizona	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
California	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
D.C.	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				AD, EP	AD, EP
Hawaii	AD	AD	AD	AD					AD
Illinois	AD	AD		AD	AD				AD, EP
Iowa	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
Kansas	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
Maine	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
Massachusetts	EP	EP				EP		EP	EP
Michigan	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
Minnesota	AD, EP	AD, EP							AD, EP
Mississippi	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				AD, EP	AD, EP
Nebraska	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
Nevada	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				AD, EP	AD, EP
New Hampshire	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP		AD, EP
New Mexico	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
New York	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				EP	AD, EP
North Carolina	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				AD, EP	AD, EP
North Dakota	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD	AD, EP					AD, EP
Oregon	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
South Dakota	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				AD, EP	AD, EP
Tennessee	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				EP	AD, EP
Utah	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP		AD, EP
Vermont	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP
West Virginia	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				EP	AD, EP
Wisconsin	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP					AD, EP

EXHIBIT A

**PART 2: SUMMARY OF DEFENDANTS' ARGUMENTS FOR DISMISSAL OF IPPS'
INDIVIDUAL STATE LAW CONSUMER PROTECTION CLAIMS**

	Which Plaintiffs Asserted a Claim	Defendants' Arguments for Dismissal							
		Failure To State a Claim and Plead Injury-In-Fact	Indirect Purchasers Lack Consumer Protection Standing	Indirect Purchaser Class Actions Barred	Businesses Cannot Bring Claims	Insufficient Intrastate Nexus Allegations (Exhibit E)	Not Actionable and No Right of Action for Over-Payment	Failure to Meet Specific Pleading Standards	Barred By Statute of Limitations (Exhibit J)
Arkansas	AD	AD	AD				AD	AD	AD
California	AD, EP	AD, EP				EP			AD, EP
D.C.	AD, EP	AD, EP			AD				AD, EP
Florida	AD, EP	AD, EP						AD, EP	AD, EP
Hawaii	EP	EP							AD, EP
Missouri	EP	EP							EP
Montana	EP	EP		EP		EP			EP
New Mexico	AD, EP	AD, EP						AD, EP	AD, EP
New York	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP			EP		AD, EP	AD, EP
North Carolina	AD, EP	AD, EP				AD, EP			AD, EP
Rhode Island	EP	EP						EP	EP
South Carolina	AD	AD		AD					AD
Vermont	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP						AD, EP

EXHIBIT A

**PART 3: SUMMARY OF DEFENDANTS' ARGUMENTS FOR DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFFS'
INDIVIDUAL STATE LAW UNJUST ENRICHMENT CLAIMS**

	Which Plaintiffs Asserted a Claim	Defendants' Arguments for Dismissal							
		Failure To State a Claim and Plead Injury-In-Fact	No Named Resident Plaintiff for Claim Alleged	No Claim Based on Failed Antitrust or Consumer Protection Claims	Claim Barred Where Party Received the Benefit of Its Bargain (Exhibit F)	Claim Unavailable Where No Direct Conferral of Benefit (Exhibit G)	Claim Barred Where Consideration Paid for Benefit Received (Exhibit H)	Claim Fails for Other Reasons (Exhibit I)	Barred By Statute of Limitations (Exhibit J)
Arizona	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP
Arkansas	AD	AD		AD	AD				AD
California	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP			AD, EP	AD, EP
D.C.	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP			AD, EP
Florida	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP
Hawaii	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD	AD, EP				AD, EP	AD, EP
Illinois	AD	AD		AD	AD			AD	AD, EP
Iowa	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP			AD, EP
Kansas	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP
Maine	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP
Massachusetts	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP
Michigan	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP			AD, EP
Minnesota	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP
Mississippi	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP			AD, EP	AD, EP
Missouri	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP		AD, EP
Montana	EP	EP		EP					EP
Nebraska	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP				AD, EP
Nevada	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP		AD, EP
New Hampshire	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP		AD, EP
New Mexico	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP				AD, EP
New York	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP			AD, EP
North Carolina	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP			AD, EP
North Dakota	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP
Oregon	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP				AD, EP
Rhode Island	EP	EP		EP	EP	EP			EP
South Carolina	AD	AD		AD	AD	AD		AD	AD

EXHIBIT A

	Which Plaintiffs Asserted a Claim	Defendants' Arguments for Dismissal							
		Failure To Plead Injury-In-Fact	No Named Resident Plaintiff for Claim Alleged	No Claim Based on Failed Antitrust or Consumer Protection Claims	Claim Barred Where Party Received the Benefit of Its Bargain (Exhibit F)	Claim Unavailable Where No Direct Conferral of Benefit (Exhibit G)	Claim Barred Where Consideration Paid for Benefit Received (Exhibit H)	Claim Fails for Other Reasons (Exhibit I)	Barred By Statute of Limitations (Exhibit J)
South Dakota	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP		AD, EP
Tennessee	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP
Utah	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP	AD, EP
Vermont	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP		AD, EP
West Virginia	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP				AD, EP	AD, EP
Wisconsin	AD, EP	AD, EP		AD, EP			AD, EP		AD, EP